

Southern Oregon/Northern California Technical Recovery Team  
Notes for meeting of 24 October 2001, Santa Cruz, California

DRAFT Minutes and additional items concerning Technical Recovery Team

Present: Walt Duffy, Dave Hillemeier, George Kautsky, Tom Lisle, Mike McCain, Mike Rode, Tom Wainwright, Tommy Williams (chair), Greg Bryant (coordinator).  
Absent - Chuck Huntington.

Guests: Tom Shaw (USFWS), Tom Satterthwaite (ODFW).

I. Meeting schedule, locations, conduct

Meetings: Meetings will be held primarily in Arcata at either the BLM or FWS/NMFS buildings, with some future meetings in southern Oregon. Tentatively, meetings were scheduled the first Tuesday of each month. Field trips will be scheduled in conjunction with some meetings. The next few meetings will be:

December: 4 December 2001, Arcata

January: Skip (RSRP meets in Seattle)

February: 5 February, Arcata

March/April: Joint with RSRP meeting in Santa Cruz

Process: The team will work towards consensus, although this might not be the best approach and seeking consensus will not be a strong focus. It was recognized that an approach was needed that could deal with scientific disagreement and would allow for the expression of such disagreement. More discussion is required to address a process to decide what level of dissent would warrant inclusion in reports or trigger additional or extended analyses based on alternative interpretations/scenarios. Other methods (such as likelihood-point voting) were discussed as alternatives.

Meetings will be open to the public, and details will be made available on the Santa Cruz Laboratory Recovery Planning website. Efforts will be made to publicize the existence of this website, and the availability of information, but not to advertise specific meetings. Non-TRT members may attend as observers, but opportunity for limited comments will be provided; individuals' time for comments will be limited, but total time should not be.

Document exchange and editing will be done primarily through e-mail and the Xerox DocuShare server at NMFS Santa Cruz Laboratory. For greatest compatibility with TRT member's computers, documents will be in Rich Text Format (\*.rtf) or sent as Portable Document Format (\*.pdf) until a decision is reached concerning standard word processing and spreadsheet software.

Something of interest based on discussions in the North Central California Technical Recovery Team concerning consensus included:

- a decision against a strong focus on seeking consensus for a number of reasons, including the potential failure of consensus approaches to accommodate and to express uncertainty, and the potential for such approaches to stifle minority opinion, among others.
- if a TRT member strongly supports an alternative interpretation of data, it will be included in any reports, analyses, etc., produced by the TRT at the member's discretion.
- some greater level of TRT assent will be required for an alternative interpretation/scenario to warrant parallel, alternative analyses.
- for cases where a decision must be reached between competing alternatives, an assessment must be made, or other similar situations, the group will use a combination of voting systems - a likelihood-point system in which each member has 10 points to distribute among alternatives as they see fit, and a simultaneous, one-person-one-vote system. The former allows individuals to express uncertainty, but may allow one person with a strongly held opinion to sway a decision. Anonymous vote distributions will be recorded and retained to examine whether this occurs, and for comparison to single-vote results.

## II. Workgroups

Possible workgroups needed were identified in three areas: Population identification, demography, and landscape/habitat. It was decided that population identification should be tackled by the team as a whole for the first cut, followed by refinement by individual workgroups. Two initial workgroups were formed--"Demographics" and "Landscape/Habitat Mapping."

**Demographics:** This workgroup will characterize variation in life history of coho salmon within the SONC ESU (and possibly outside), exploring mechanisms contributing to variation. Walt Duffy will chair this workgroup, with assistance from Dave Hillemeier and Tom Satterthwaite. Lists were developed of types of data desired and possible participants from outside the TRT. Greg Bryant will meet with Duffy and Hillemeier to discuss data sets and data summaries used by NMFS Southwest Region for previous coho salmon analysis. This group will have a summary of data available and an initial analysis by April.

Landscape/Habitat Mapping: This workgroup will begin gathering geographic information on fish distributions and physical characteristics of coho salmon habitats, and will provide guidance to NMFS GIS staff. An immediate task will be to get a 1:24K map of the domain with streams, HUCs, and fish distributions. No chair was designated, but Tommy Williams will initiate the work, with assistance from George Kautsky, Tom Lisle, and others. An effort underway to produce GIS layers with historic and present distribution of salmonids is near completion, Greg Bryant and Mike McCain are working on this effort and will be able to facilitate the transfer of these data to the TRT GIS support people when it is available (we are hopeful that draft maps might be together for December meeting). A list was developed of possible participants from outside the TRT.

### III. Data Needs and Sources

Data needs for population identification and risk assessment were listed. Data sets have been identified for the California portion of the ESU through the NMFS "California Salmonid Research/Monitoring Survey." Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) will provide a list of data available in Oregon. NMFS Southwest Region also has a contract with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) to gather and geo-reference data from California Department of Fish and Game documents into a database. Team members were asked to review the NMFS Monitoring Survey documents and send names of additional data sources or contacts to Tommy Williams (see list below). This group hopes to have a GIS basemap of the ESU ready by next meeting.

### IV. Tasks

Initial tasks (for the next month) were identified:

- Continue gathering data sets and data contacts.
- Seek outside members for initial workgroups.
- (See also individual workgroup tasks above.)

### V. Habitat issues

Issues regarding how habitat information should be incorporated into delisting criteria were discussed, with a report to the joint SONC/Northern California TRT meeting the next day (see separate notes).

### VI. Next Meeting

4 December, BLM Office in Arcata. Agenda topics include:

- Demographics - working group update
- Landscape/Habitat Mapping - working group update
- Overview of new data obtained
- DocuShare server kickoff
- "Strawfish" cut at population structure
- Continued discussion on decision making process within TRT

## VII. Additional items, not discussed at 24 October 2001 meeting

Several members of the SONC TRT have inquired into the role of the Region in the technical recovery process. The Region will oversee the implementation phase of recovery. The critical link between the Region and policy individuals and the products produced by Technical Recovery Teams will be the Regional Coordinator. The outline below concerning the role of the recovery coordinator in phase I of the recovery process (Technical Recovery Teams) was provided by Miles Croom, North-Central California Coast Recovery Coordinator, based on discussions among the four California recovery coordinators.

### Role of Recovery Coordinator

1. Serves as liaison between the Science Center/Technical Recovery Team and the Southwest Region; provides policy guidance, and interprets for the Center/TRT how the work of the TRT fits into and promotes "broad-sense recovery" (Waples term, for how de-listing criteria are folded into the bigger recovery picture that includes administrative recovery);
2. Monitors TRT meetings as a non-voting member to understand and stay aware of where the TRTs are in their process; what the issues are; helps to ensure coordination with other recovery processes (e.g., linking TRTs with phase II recovery planning efforts);
3. Provides primary support for outreach/education activities between the public and TRTs, e.g., workshops (as appropriate, or other in-person venues that might involve members of the TRT), helps to orchestrate public review of TRT work products, ensures that TRT work products are broadly disseminated, generates outreach materials like brochures, fact sheets, etc.